IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl.Misc. No.76685-M of 2006
Date of Decision:- 19.02.2007

Naveen ....Petitioner(s)

through
Mrs.Sarla Chaudhary, Advocate

vs.

State of Punjab & anr. ....Respondent(s)

through
Mr.B.S.Baath, AAG, Punjab.

***

CORAM:-HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT.

***

SURYA KANT, J.

The written statement filed on behalf of the respondents in Court is taken on record.

The petitioner who is undergoing life sentence under Sections 302, 323, 506/34 IPC is aggrieved at the communication dated 22.11.2006 received from the Superintendent, District Jail, Gurgaon informing him that the revenue record produced by him does not indicate that he is owner in possession of the agricultural land, therefore, his case is not being forwarded for agricultural parole.

In the written statement, the respondents have come up with a stand that earlier also the respondents had released him on six weeks' parole for agricultural operations from 19.1.2006 to 3.3.2006. The respondents, thus, themselves have admitted that the petitioner's claim for his release on agricultural operations, was found admissible.

If that is so, no changed circumstances have been pointed out in the written statement on the basis of which the petitioner can be deprived of the said concession.

Consequently, this petition is allowed; the respondents are directed to reconsider the petitioner's case for his release on parole for agricultural operations for the year 2007 in the light of the observations made hereinabove. The needful shall be done within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

February 19, 2007 **(SURYA KANT)**
poonam **JUDGE**